REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.   Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761 (hereinafter Ching) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472 (hereinafter Brodsky).

Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761 (hereinafter Ching) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472 (hereinafter Brodsky) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,311 (hereinafter Gerard).

Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761 (hereinafter Ching) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472 (hereinafter Brodsky) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,741,982 (hereinafter Soderstrom).

2.   Response to Claim Objections

Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 17 and 20 are objected to because of a number of informalities. The claims are amended to address the objections. The Examiner is thanked for a very thorough review of the claims.

3.   Response to 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 have been amended to distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Therefore, the rejections have been overcome.

4.   Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ching in view of Brodsky.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on the applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In the present case, both Ching and Brodsky fail to teach or suggest at least one limitation in the claims. Ching provides a system and method for the visual customization of business object interfaces. In particular, a "graphical user interface is provided which displays all of the business objects available to the system in a menu-driven format. The user selects the business object whose interface needs to be customized. Upon this selection, a comprehensive list of methods which are available to the business object is displayed. The user then selects the particular method which needs to be used by the application program under development. Upon selection of the method, a comprehensive list of parameters which are available to that business object are then displayed. The user then selects the parameters which are needed for the application program to interface with the business object. The end goal is to allow the user to select only the methods and parameters which he intends to use in the application program" (Ching, Col.2, lines 49-63).

Ching does not, however, teach or suggest the claim limitation of "a table in which a data object type has a respective associated record writer" (Claim 1, emphasis added). In particular, Ching only specifies a hierarchical data structure and "the metadata of the business object is stored in a hierarchical data structure" (Ching, Col.6, lines 21-22, Figure 8). However, the hierarchical data structure as taught by Ching does not teach or suggest a table nor a data object type with a respective associated record writer as claimed. Instead, the hierarchical data structure only provides for the metadata of the business object. More specifically, "metadata info

312 which is information about the object including its hierarchical data structure of available methods, parameters and fields, as well as set of code for each method" (Ching, Col.4, lines 47-50).

Brodsky fails to rectify the deficiencies of Ching. Brodsky teaches a method for providing a change and accounting log in an object-oriented system. More particularly, the log entry identifies the invoked function, input parameters and output parameter in an application programming interface (API). However, nowhere in Brodsky is there any mention of the claim limitation of "a table in which a data object type has a respective associated record writer" (Claim 1).

In view of the remarks above, it is also submitted that Ching in view of Brodsky fails to render claim 11 obvious. Accordingly, claims 1, 11 and their dependent claims are also allowable for at least the reason stated above.

5.   Conclusion

Having tendered the above remarks and amended the claims as indicated herein, the Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been addressed and that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Jaina Chua at (408) 947-8200.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 9, 2005

Chze Koon Chua
Reg. No. 53,831

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200